

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph set forth in section 2 on page 2 of the final Office Action of November 4, 2003 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner had objected to the recitation of "at the same axial position" in claim 14, because the Examiner did not consider it to be clear relative to whom or what the axial position was being defined. In view of the Examiner's concern, it has been deemed simplest to just cancel this limitation from the claim, as it is not, in any case, necessary to distinguish over the prior art of record. Such cancellation should not represent any new issue for consideration by the Examiner, as the limitation was in any case not clear in the mind of the Examiner. Nonetheless, the cancellation of this limitation should not be deemed as any acquiescence to the position taken by the Examiner.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the above amendments to claim 14 be entered as placing the present application into better form for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuru KONDO et al.

By: 

Nils E. Pedersen

Registration No. 33,145

Attorney for Applicants

NEP/krq
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 25, 2004